

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
AUSTIN DIVISION**

DEREK ARREDONDO,
Plaintiff

V.

**CITY OF SAN MARCOS, BOB
KLETT, BERT LUMBRERAS,
SAN MARCOS CITY COUNCIL
MEMBERS, HAYS COUNTY,
GARY CUTLER, SAN MARCOS
DOE OFFICERS, HAYS COUNTY
DOE OFFICERS,
*Defendants***

No. 1:22-CV-00684-DAE

ORDER

Before the Court is Plaintiff's Motion to Stay Case Pending Resolution of Criminal Case or in the Alternative Motion to Extend Scheduling Order Deadlines, Dkt. 27. The District Judge referred the motion to the undersigned for disposition. The Court set the motion for hearing, Dkt. 45, and after considering the parties' filings, the applicable law, and the parties' arguments at that hearing, the Court announced its ruling on the motion, and the reasons for it, on the record. This written order memorializes that ruling.

The Court **GRANTS IN PART and DENIES IN PART** Plaintiff's motion, Dkt. 27. In particular, the Court **DENIES** Plaintiff's motion for a stay of the proceedings pending resolution of his yet-to-be-filed habeas action. And the Court **GRANTS IN PART** Plaintiff's motion to extend scheduling order deadlines, as set out below. The Court **DENIES** all other requested relief.

The Court **ORDERS** Defendants to produce, within 30 days of today's order, any documents or recordings addressed in section B of their respective Initial Disclosures (*see* Dkt. 48-1, at 13, 27).

The Court **FURTHER ORDERS** that, within 14 days of both Defendants' having completed the above-ordered production, Plaintiff may supplement his summary-judgment responses to address any arguments based on the production ordered here. Plaintiff's supplements, if any, shall be limited to 5 pages. Defendants may supplement their reply briefs to address Plaintiff's supplemental response arguments within 7 days of Plaintiff's supplemental responses being filed, and the supplemental reply briefs will likewise be limited to 5 pages.

SIGNED June 3, 2024.



DUSTIN M. HOWELL
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE